Faculty Senate
Meeting of May 4, 1999
2:30 p.m. in Room 219N of the James R. Connor University Center

Call to Order: Chair Erdmann called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

1. Roll Call:
   a. Senators present: Anderson, Bren, Cartwright, Clements, de Onis, Eamon, Ellenwood, Epps, Erdmann, Freiberg, Ghosh, Griffin, Hanson, Heiss, Hogan, Huang, Karges, Klug, Kozlowski, Longrie, Macur, Marks, Molloy, Monfils, Ossers, Parks, Phanord, Powell, Rottet, Schauer, Stinson, Teske, Topp, Weston.
   b. Senators absent: Bradley, Yin.

2. Approval of minutes of the April 13 meeting: Macur/Hogan moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 13, 1999. Approved as presented by unanimous consent.

3. Report of Committees:
   a. Report of the Search & Screen Committee for Chancellor. Senator Macur indicated that a contract offer has been made, but that it is unknown to the committee who was chosen.
   b. Reports of the University Curriculum Committee
      i. March 5 (unfinished from April 13th Faculty Senate meeting) Clements/Epps moved the approval of all of the March 5 UCC report (parts 1-5). Approved. (FS989-36)
      ii. March 19 (unfinished from April 13 Faculty Senate meeting)
          (1) Clements/Macur moved approval of item 1 through 11 (7 & 10 information only). Item 1. 900-104 New Student Seminar was discussed at length, Senators noting that there may be problems centering around the awarding of credit, staffing, and the origin of funding. Linda Howat (New Student Programs) indicated that the seminar would carry one credit and would be counted as part of degree. Staffing would be voluntary. Various senators expressed concerns: that the course should be taught as part of load for remuneration; that the course is inappropriate for general studies; that by using volunteers to staff the seminar the normal controls and safeguards of faculty membership are not in place; that the “overload” nature of staffing is not a good precedent to set.
             (a) Schauer/Eamon moved that item #1 (New Student Seminar [900-104] of the March 19 UCC report be referred back to the University Curriculum Committee. Yes 17; No 14. Motion passed. (FS989-37)
          (2) Items 2 through 11 of the March 19th UCC report were approved on a voice vote. (FS989-38)
      iii. April 9  Epps/Cartwright moved the approval of all items. Item #8 (Curriculum Process/Procedure proposal) was objected to on the basis of potential abuse of the faculty senate chair.
          (1) Schauer/Parks moved to return item #8 to the University Curriculum Committee. A lengthy discussion ensued. The Senate voted NOT to return item #8 to the UCC on a Yes: 13; No: 20 vote.
          (2) Kozlowski/Hogan moved to insert “and” in the second sentence of the proposal so it would read “...via e-mail and posted on the web”, and to insert “teaching” in the third sentence so it would read “...within five teaching days...”. (a) Topp moved to divide the motion. “...via e-mail and posted on the web” Passed.”...within five teaching days...” Passed.
(3) Epps/Phanord moved to refer item #8 to the Faculty Personnel Rules Committee and remove item #8 from the report. The Faculty Personnel Rules Committee is to report to the Senate at its September 14 meeting. Passed. (FS989-39)

(4) The Senate subsequently approved items 1 through 7 of the April 9 UCC report. (FS989-40)

iv. April 23: Macur/Monfils moved approval of the report of the UCC dated April 23.
   (1) Schauer/Phanord moved to return item #1 to the UCC (Changes in degree - BBA). Yes: 10; No: 15. Motion failed.
   Approve items 1-12. Approved. (FS989-41)

   c. Motion concerning the number of course repeats.
      i. Cartwright/Hogan moved to approve.
         (1) Hanson/Macur moved to substitute the following in the first sentence of the resolution “...limited to a maximum of three repeats during their undergraduate work...”. Strike “for grade replacement” in sentence one and two. Yes: 13; No 14. Motion defeated.
         (2) Hogan/Ghosh move to “...grant up to five additional repeats...”. Defeated.
         Motion to approve. Yes: 14; No: 14. A recount was called. Yes: 16; No: 14. Motion passed. (FS989-42)

   d. Report of the Personnel Rules Committee (unfinished from April 13)
      i. Hogan/Phanord moved to approve the report of the Personnel Rules Committee.
         (1) Eamon/Schauer moved to refer the report back to the Personnel Rules Committee. Approved. (FS989-43)

      ii. Resolution on format for personnel data: Ossers/Ghosh moved the resolution. Provost Prior reviewed the “Green Binder.”
          (1) Marks/Parks moved to strike “and post-tenure review” and to add “and” between “promotion” and “merit.” Yes: 14; No: 5. Passed.
          (2) Molloy/Parks moved to delete “merit” from the resolution. Yes: 14; No: 14. Motion failed. The original resolution as modified passed. (FS989-44)

Schauer/Ghosh moved a special order of business:

Resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its gratitude to Chancellor H. Gaylon Greenhill for his years of service to UW-Whitewater as a faculty member, Dean, Vice Chancellor, and Chancellor. Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate wishes Chancellor Greenhill and his wife, Hannah, a long and enjoyable retirement. Unanimously Approved. (FS989-45)

A quorum was called for by Senator Schauer. There not being a quorum present, the chair adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m. to reconvene Tuesday, May 11th at 2:15 p.m.

The meeting reconvened on May 11, 1999 at 2:15 p.m. in Room 219N of the James R. Connor University Center.


The following Senators were absent: de Onis, Eamon, Ellenwood (informed chair), Hanson, Karges, Macur, Marks (informed chair), Molloy (informed chair), Parks, Rottet (informed chair), Yin.


ii. Senator Epps indicated an urgent need for a representative from the College of Arts and Communication to sit on the Faculty Rules Committee.

   e. Report of the University Promotions Standards Committee (UPSC) (unfinished from April 13)
      i. The University of Wisconsin-Whitewater University

(1) Ossers/Ghosh moved to strike all the wording in paragraph five on the first page following “also incorporate Boyer’s teacher-scholar model.” Passed.

The UPSC document as amended was passed. (FS989-46)


(1) Weston/Phanord moved to approve the report of May 4, 1999. Senator Weston offered an editorial amendment to the report (Page 4, Exhibit A - Evidence, Teaching/Job Performance, Examples of Evidence) to add: “5. Other evidence as deemed appropriate to support the job performance in non-teaching assignment evaluation given by the department to the applicant.” The UPSC accepted the editorial amendment.

(2) Epps/Phanord moved to amend (page 6, 3a): “Critical evaluation” to be replaced by analysis and review. Motion defeated on a Yes: 9; No: 13 vote.

(3) Kozlowski/Ghosh move to remove all references to the number of narrative pages expected of the applicant. Motion failed on a Yes: 7; No: 13 vote.

The main motion - to approve all eight page of the UPSC document dated 5/4/99 passed. (FS989-47)

Epps/Ghosh moved a Special Order of Business to take up agenda item 4C. Passed.


f. Report of the Plan 2008 Committee (unfinished from 4/13) Phanord/Ossers moved: “Resolved that the Faculty Senate supports Plan 2008 to be reported to UW System Administration.” Passed. (FS989-49)

g. Diversity and Equal Opportunity Compliance Officer (unfinished from 4/13)

1. Schauer/Powell moved that the qualifications for the Diversity and Equal Opportunity Compliance Officer be revised to reflect the functions which they are asked to perform in Title 7 and Title 9 compliance; that is, possession of a terminal degree in Human Resources Management, Counseling, Industrial Psychology, Law, or related fields; and that this position be located in the Division of Academic Affairs. Passed. (FS989-50)

ii. Schauer/Kozlowski moved that the current search for a Diversity, Equal Opportunity Compliance Officer be canceled pending revision of the job description. Passed. (FS989-51)

4. New Business

a. Election to Campus Landscape and Planning Committee. Steve Karges was elected.

b. No retirement resolution were considered.

c. (Considered earlier as a special order: see above)

d. Resolution in support of “lifting the $12,000 compensation restriction...”. The resolution given in the agenda was not moved.

4. New Business

a. Election to Campus Landscape and Planning Committee. Steve Karges was elected.

b. No retirement resolution were considered.

c. (Considered earlier as a special order: see above)

d. Resolution in support of “lifting the $12,000 compensation restriction...”. The resolution given in the agenda was not moved.

e. Resolution regarding UWS recommendation of $11 million GPR/PR-0 in FY-00 and $19 million GPR/PR-0 and 17 FTE GPR in FY-01 to support initiatives at UW-Madison. Schauer/Longrie resolved that The “Madison Initiative: is a UW-Madison salary scheme that, if adopted, will offer compensation to UW-Madison faculty for the purpose of bringing salaries on that campus to levels equivalent to the salary levels of faculty in Madison’s peer group institutions. The plan includes a request to the Wisconsin Legislature to provide the money to accomplish this goal. It is promised by the makers of the proposal that an endowment would be raised from private sources, e.g. WARF, to provide a continuing match to these salary funds. The endowment for that
purpose does not yet exist. The money requested from the Legislature would come from monies dedicated for the salaries of UW-System faculty. The inclusion of this proposal in a salary bill makes less certain the 5.2%/5.2% proposal that is currently recommended for the rest of us by UW-System. Average salaries all over the UW-System are below CUPA averages. No similar proposal is made for UW-Milwaukee, the other US-System research institution.

Resolved that the Faculty Senate believes that salary catch-up policies, if adopted, should apply to all UW-System institutions, and that the “Madison Initiative” should not be adopted or recommended to the Legislature. Passed. (FS989-52)

5. Chair’s report of his action taken regarding referendum on “A/B grading”. In March, the Faculty Senate requested that the Elections Committee include a referendum on the Spring 1999 Faculty Elections ballot to ascertain the will of the faculty on the proposed “A/B grading system.” The following wording was suggested.

On January 22, the University Curriculum Committee supported the following proposed change in the grading system for undergraduate courses:

A=4.00, AB=3.50, B=3.00, BC=2.50, C=2.00, D=1.00, F=0.00

On March 9, the Faculty Senate requested a referendum of the Faculty on the proposed change. The results of this referendum may help the Chancellor decide whether to implement the proposed grading system. Do you favor the proposed change?

___ Yes, I support the proposed change.
___ No, I do not support the proposed change.

In response, Boris Teske, Chair of the Elections Committee, sent the following e-mail message to Senate Chair Erdmann:

Upon receiving your text for the referendum on the proposed grading system, I distributed it to the four other members of the Elections Committee and requested their responses as to whether or not the Elections Committee should comply with the Senate’s request to include it with the ballots in the Spring Election (next week). I voiced my own objections. Two other members were likewise opposed to adding this faculty poll to the ballots. The other two neither supported not rejected the Senate’s request, but expressed willingness to go along with the majority of the committee. Consequently, I must inform you that the Elections Committee, without dissent, declines to perform the service requested by the Senate. I regret that it has taken so long for the Elections Committee to come to this conclusion, but I only just heard from the last of the members to respond today.

A quorum was called for. There not being a quorum present, the Senate suspended business at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Hadley Klug,
Faculty Senate Secretary